

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/552,036	FUJIMOTO, TOYOHISA	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MARC S. ZIMMER	1765	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) MARC S. ZIMMER.

(2) Sheldon Landsman.

**Date of Interview:** 4 November 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

---

Claims discussed:

---

Prior art documents discussed:

---

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

  

/Marc S. Zimmer/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1765

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant had been advised that it would be necessary to reduce the length of the abstract to make it compliant with PTO rules. Applicant subsequently brought to the Examiner's attention two Information Disclosure Statements that had been filed after a notice of allowability had been issued. Applicant explained that the basis for the two IDS was a third party submission in a foreign office the contents of which contained two previously unknown documents and a third which had been recited in earlier-filed IDS. Applicant intentionally filed two Information Disclosure Statements because, whereas it was possible to certify that the first two had been "first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office..." but, insofar as the third had already been known to Applicant and, indeed, been revealed to the Examiner in an earlier submission, the same statement would not have applied to that document. (Applicant only resubmitted this reference for reconsideration because, this time, a machine-generated English translation was being furnished.) However, Applicant inadvertently checked the the same certifying box in both IDS and the Applicant wanted the record to reflect that this was done in error in the case of the IDS that named the Japanese document earlier disclosed. .